

The Protestant Review

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Published by

CHRIST'S MISSION

EVANGELICAL—NON-SECTARIAN.

Founded by the late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, 1883.

MANUEL FERRANDO, Director and Editor.

331 West 57th Street,

NEW YORK.

Vol. XXXIII

FEBRUARY, 1916

No. 2

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| We Two (Poem)..... | 34 |
| Editorial Notes—Early Tampering with the Word of God..... | 35 |
| “ “ Christ's Mission Work..... | 38 |
| “ “ Purgatory Emptied by Mary..... | 43 |
| Righteousness in Our Public Schools. By Mrs. C. Starr, Secretary of the Educational Union, Chicago, Ill..... | 44 |
| Assault Upon Public Schools..... | 53 |
| Letter to Cardinal Gibbons, XLVII. By Manuel Ferrando..... | 55 |
| Religious Liberty in Peru..... | 64 |

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, POSTPAID.

All subscriptions are payable annually in advance.

| | | | |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| Subscription per year..... | \$1.50 | To Ministers and Missionaries.... | \$1.00 |
| Single copy | 15 | Twenty or more copies, each..... | 10 |
| Ten copies to one address, per year, each | 1.25 | Agents, 20 or more copies per year, each | 1.00 |

Subscription per year in English money, Six shillings threepence.

Remittances should be made by Check, P. O. Money Order, Express Order or Draft on New York, made payable to Christ's Mission or to The Protestant Review, 331 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York. Cash should be sent by Registered Mail. United States postage stamps received in small quantities and small denominations. Do not send stamps above ten cents each. Do not send Canadian or other foreign stamps or money.

Expiration. The date of the address label, on the wrapper, indicates the month and year of the expiration of the subscription. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed.

Change of Address. In making changes, send both old and new address.

Correspondence. Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 West 57th Street, New York City.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.

WE TWO

I cannot do it alone,
The waves run fast and high,
And the fogs close chill around,
And the light goes out in the sky;
But I know that we two
Shall win in the end—
Jesus and I.

I cannot row it myself,
My boat on the raging sea;
But beside me sits Another
Who pulls or steers with me,
And I know that we two
Shall come safe into port—
His child and He.

Coward and wayward and weak,
I change with the changing sky;
To-day so eager and brave,
To-morrow not caring to try;
But He never gives in,
So we two shall win—
Jesus and I.

Strong and tender and true,
Crucified once for me!
Ne'er will He change, I know,
Whatever I may be!
We shall finish our course
And reach home at last—
His child and He.

The Protestant Review

"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."
(1 Cor. 16: 13.)

Vol. XXXIII

FEBRUARY, 1916

No. 2

EDITORIAL NOTES

Early Tampering with the Word of God.

The study of the old manuscripts clearly shows that men without conscience have been tampering with Holy Scripture since the early ages, in order to make it conform with their own views, or confirm what they wished to inculcate in the minds of others for their own interested purposes.

This proves more conclusively than anything else that the Scriptures were held in the general opinion of the early Christians to be the one absolute authority. Therefore those who dared to change their words and meaning can be considered as little better than unscrupulous atheists, without faith in or reverence for what the Apostles had transmitted as the very words of Christ. There is no early heresy but what claims to be based upon the Scriptures. It is a very usual thing to find in studying the heresies, which at once began to spring up, words such as these, "As the Scriptures say," or, "as it is written"; and equally common is it to find the adherents of one form of heresy accusing those of another of mutilating the Scriptures. But each and every sect pretends to base the authority for its tenets upon the "one true version" of God's Word.

This ought to warn us not to rely so implicitly upon isolated texts. The early controversies were so numerous and diversified in character that we must expect to find numerous and varied texts. In the time of Jerome there was such a chaos in the Latin manuscripts that he was compelled to appeal to the "*Greek truth*" in order to render his version. But even the *Vulgate* of Jerome cannot claim our complete acceptance as the authentic and original form of God's Word. Jerome wrote his version at the command of the Bishop of Rome, and Jerome was an enthusiastic follower of Origen, being unwilling to draw

from any other source than the Greek edition of the New Testament which had Origen's support and authority. So here we have two powerful reasons for disregarding the Vulgate as the final word. First, because it was the work not of any body of men, but of one man alone, who came to Rome to propagate in the West the Alexandrian School; second, because he was engaged by a pope who at that time was moving Heaven and earth to establish his supremacy, and of course nothing could better further his ambition than to be able to support his claims by the wisdom of the Greeks.

All this may cause confusion to some who may conclude that we have no reliable Scripture and therefore no sure anchor-age for our faith. To avoid such confusion is the purpose of these editorials. We wish to point out that the whole spirit of the teaching of Christ is the all-important thing, and not any isolated text. The discovery of the Spanish manuscript, now in this country, and the alterations found in other old manuscripts, are an added cause for our veneration of the Scriptures, for the reason that we now know where to trace the difficulties that present themselves in the New Testament text.

I have already expressed my belief that had our Lord's sayings been faithfully transmitted to us as they left His lips, we should never have had occasion for so many dissensions and differences of interpretation. The earlier the manuscript, the more clearly and unequivocally are attested the Deity of our Lord, His atoning death and His resurrection. Any obscure passage on these important subjects has been interpolated or written over erasures of the older text. And there are many vivid and beautiful lights thrown upon the character and teachings of our Lord by the older forms of passages, which have without doubt been deliberately changed for a purpose by the ecclesiastical scribe.

Let us take one text as an illustration: In John 20: 21, our Bible, in agreement with the Vulgate, gives us the following commission of Jesus to His disciples, after His resurrection: "As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." Now, the commentators in the Roman Church interpret this saying as the transmission of power. "All power is given unto Me," and every other text that attests the authority of Jesus is grouped

with the above to prove that our Lord bestowed His own power and authority directly upon the pope, and established through him the supremacy of the priesthood. But Dr. Buchanan, of Oxford, whose research forms the basis for these editorials, has discovered that the Spanish text, which is older than the Vulgate, but which has also been altered by later scribes, showed that these words were written over others. Upon careful examination he found that the original words in the Spanish MS. were these: "*As He that is mighty sent Me unto suffering, even so, for My sake, send I you unto suffering.*" How impressive and wonderful are these words of Jesus! Yet the papacy needed authority, and accumulated authority, for the establishment of its claims to supremacy, and the supremacy of its hierarchy. Without the alteration of this text, or rather the omission of a few words in it, I do not believe the papacy could have risen to the power which it still exercises to a great extent and claims in full. So there is a self-evident reason for the alteration.

Now, let us consider a moment the beautiful spiritual significance of this discovery. The commission of Jesus was not one of dominion, it was one of service, and, if need be, suffering in service, and the text with this rendering is in conformity with the true mission and teaching of our Lord. By words and deeds He established the fact that He did not come to be served, but to serve. He was not of this world, and He was going to claim no power in this world. When James and John sought to be seated on His right hand and on His left when He should come into His Kingdom, His answer was the question whether they were ready to be "baptized with His baptism" and to "drink of His cup."

Think, on the other hand, for a moment of the evils which the misinterpretation of this text, caused by the omission of its most important words, has brought about in the ministry of the Roman Church. Think of the greed, ambition, tyranny, oppression and all the iniquity attendant upon these false claims of Divine power. The priesthood would never have been corrupted by simony, for example, had each priest been taught that his calling meant, not reign, but suffering. And even among churches calling themselves Protestant I fear this erroneous

idea has crept in, together with the attractions of large salaries and worldly influence.

But here Jesus calls His disciples, and through them each one of us, to tread the path of suffering He trod; He tells us that it is necessary to be His disciples that we deny ourselves, take up our cross and follow Him. He tells us expressly that we are sent as sheep among wolves; there is no exception made. He spoke to His chief Apostles and told them that He who would be greatest among them should be as he who serves. Thank God, the pens of scribes, though they may blasphemously have changed words and phrases, could not alter the spirit of Christ's teaching, and His Holy Spirit has in all ages found true disciples who could discern it and interpret it in their own lives and words, and there have been always, among both wise and simple, true followers of the Lamb.

"Who best can drink His cup of woe, triumphant over pain—
Who patient bears his cross below, he follows in His train."

Christ's Mission Work.

At our Sunday afternoon services we are continuing our series of lectures on idolatry, and we hope to bring forward many more incidents which will help to open the eyes of the Catholics who attend, as well as to inform Protestants as to the real facts concerning this practise in the Roman Church. But, as we have frequently pointed out, the work of Christ's Mission is by no means to be measured by its services alone, and some of its chief opportunities for good are found in private interviews.

Last week I had one of these not unusual interviews with a Catholic lady, which shows how ignorant the Roman Church keeps her own people; and this lady was not an uneducated person, but one of exceptional intelligence and talent. I told her the subject of my lectures, and she very politely expressed her belief that it must have been given me by my Protestant "bosses." Of course, she meant that I ought to know better than to accuse the Roman Church of idolatry, as only ignorant Protestants could be capable of such a thing.

I understood her and said that I always used to feel very badly when I heard any one accuse the Church of such a pagan practise, but I had been led to think very seriously on the sub-

ject, and had finally become convinced that the accusation was not far from the truth. "Anyway," I said, "I want to convince you that I am a free man and that I am bossed by nobody. Everything I say or write is drawn from my personal experience and expresses my convictions; and there is no body of men with money enough to induce me to say what I do not know to be true."

"But you do not believe that we are so ignorant as to worship a piece of wood, do you?" asked the lady.

"Well," I said, "I never used to believe so, but I should like to discuss the subject with you, not in the spirit of trying to convince you against your will, but rather with the confidence one feels in opening his mind to another who can understand. We are taught by the Church that in worshipping images we do not direct our worship to the object but to the subject, as only Indians and other savages worship the object itself. But, do you know, I have great experience among the Indians of the Nevada, in South America? I made a study of their religion and, as I reported to Rome, I found we were mistaken in our opinion with regard to their worship.

"For instance, I was once with a tribe supposed to be fetishists, and was invited by their high-priest to witness their worship. We went out to an open field, where the Indians marched around a big squash, going through all sorts of genuflections, which were so ridiculous to me that I felt a great pity for them. When the mummerly was over, I went to walk with the high-priest alone, and I told him how badly it made me feel to see human beings descend to such a level as to worship a squash.

"Then the old man, who had always impressed me as being extraordinarily high-minded, said, 'Father, that is what I cannot understand—how a man who knows so much about many things is so ignorant concerning others! Do you really believe that we bow our knees to that squash? If you think so you do us a great injustice. We know better than that. That squash will probably be picked by its owner to-day; he may divide it among his neighbors and it will be eaten. But our idea is this: We believe that everything is moved and governed by the Supreme Ruler of the Universe. We do not know who He is, or where is His abode, but we know that He exists and that He is the

Author of all good gifts. This squash received no special attention from its owner. The land and the seed are the same; nevertheless, here is one squash which has outdone all the others in size and beauty; and we believe that He who has power to cause such growth, or to kill and blight, has given us this as a manifestation of His power. For what purpose it is, we do not know; but we take it for granted that such proofs of His power require us to acknowledge Him, and this we did, in our own way. The ceremonies that you have seen performed before the Almighty Being meant nothing more than do the different ways you have in your own country of expressing to each other your affection and esteem.

"And now, may I open my mind to you, Father? Just last night I was invited by you to attend your service, and I went with all my tribe; and may I be frank with you and tell you that I felt the same pity for you then, as you did for me this morning? The object of our worship has nothing mistakable about it. Here is something of extraordinary proportions, whose Author we believe to be the Supreme Being. We know that it is not the work of our hands. But you have in your church an image. I asked you who made it, and you told me it was made in Europe. I said, "How can you worship a thing when you know who made it?" You told me that you did not worship that image, but that it represented a very good man who had died, and that he was the object of your worship. I thought, then it is only his image, like a portrait; I asked if that was so. To my amazement you answered, "Not precisely." I was terribly shocked and amazed. Here was a thing, made by man, which did not show any work of the Supreme Being, and was not even the true portrait of the man it represented, and yet this Father bows down to it as though it had power in itself.

"There is a tribe near us whom we consider very ignorant, because they make objects with their own hands and take them to their priests, and they are taught to believe that their priests can oblige some *guanuro* (spirit) to possess the object and protect them by his power. That looks to me like your own worship, if you think that the spirit of that good man must be so charmed by that image that he comes to possess it. But, Father, has any other priest another image of the same man?"

"'Oh, there are thousands of them in our churches in Europe and all over the world,' I answered.

"'Do all of them have the same virtue?'

"'Yes, of course.'

"'Then how many spirits do the good men of your country have?'

"'One,' I answered.

"The poor man was puzzling his head to understand such a mystery. If the spirit was in one image, then there must be other spirits in the other images, and if this was neither the body of the saint nor his spirit, then it was nothing."

The good lady was somewhat amazed, but of course she did not give in. I did not expect it, either. She simply said, "Well, that is beautiful! I had no idea that Indians could think that way. But, nevertheless, you know our worship is different."

"Oh, yes," I answered; "I told you that I was not going to discuss things except with a spirit of opening our minds to each other. But let us take this case, which has often troubled my mind. I do not know if you have ever thought of it. Take an image of some particular devotion. That image is in a Church in Europe and it is enriched with special indulgences for all who worship before it, pray to it, bring votive candles or have masses said in its honor. You might get an image like it in any of the religious stores, such as Benziger Bros., have it blessed by a priest, and, nevertheless, your promises, masses and all have to be offered to the image in that church in Europe, not to the duplicate that you possess. If the worship is not given to the piece of wood, or if no virtue resides in the object, but only in what it represents, there should be no necessity for directing the believer to any particular image.

"We are told that the veneration of images is the same as the veneration we have for the photographs of those we love. But do we possess any image that any of the so-called saints would own as his portrait? It looks as if the Indian used pretty good logic when he said, 'Not the body of the saint! Not the spirit of the saint! There is no saint at all!'

"Now, is that kind of worship really directed to the subject or to the object? There are in Europe hundreds of little villages, which are so small and the people so poor that they could

not supply a meal for the priest even if they wished. And to overcome this difficulty, it happens, by the mercy of God, that in nearly every one of those little villages one or another image has miraculously appeared, and the result has been that the chaplains of those villages have become richer than a canon of any cathedral. People from all the country round go there with promises and offerings, which, as the saint does not need them, the priest feels free to make use of for his own benefit.

"I know of a particular case where a priest was sent, as a punishment, to a little village where there was no saint of fame which could bring him an income. He resolved to have one, and engaged an amateur sculptor, who for a small sum of money promised to carve the saint, provided the right kind of wood could be furnished. The priest could find only one tree that would suit the sculptor. This was a fruit tree, and the owner did not have enough faith in saints to care to lose the benefit of his fruit tree. The priest went to the man's wife and daughter and filled them with such fear that they were all going to be punished by the saint on account of his refusal to give the tree that they finally obliged the old man to give it up.

"The image was carved, a special altar erected, three days of public feast were proclaimed and special indulgences were asked from the bishop. The people of every little town in the neighborhood were invited, of course, and there was a great crowd to celebrate the advent of the new saint. There were fireworks and bull fights, and many other diversions, and from the feast alone the priest took his toll of over five hundred dollars. Every one went to the church to admire the saint but the stubborn old man. The afternoon of the last day of the feast the daughters who were ashamed of their father obliged him to go. He planted himself before the image and said in a Spanish rhyme which it is not easy to translate:

"O glorious Saint Martin, I knew you as an orange-tree!
All the miracles you perform, nail them on my forehead!"

"Strange to say, by the ingenuity of the priest that image has performed miracles in all parts of the world, and it made the priest so rich that when I knew him he possessed more property in real estate than any one else in that section. And the bishop who sent him there as a punishment used all means to get

him out in order to give the chaplaincy to his nephew but could never succeed.

"Now, is not that a good reason for attributing so many miracles to the images? And is that teaching idolatry or not?

"We might say that could only happen among the ignorant, but it makes the conduct of the Church the more culpable on that account.

"But you have right here in New York the same idolatry. You have only to go to St. Anne's Church and you will see persons there who, judging by their dress and appearance, would not allow themselves to be classified among the ignorant, and yet they bow before the relic of the 'Grandmother of God' without stopping to think that the only real thing in that big fraud is the increase of the church revenues."

Here my Catholic friend surrendered; all her defenses were broken down. "Well," she exclaimed, "you have opened my eyes this morning to things I never thought of before. You make me think of so many things I never was able to understand. You *ought* to preach about that! And if I were called to preach, I would begin where you left off."

Purgatory Emptied by Mary.

"The promise made by our Blessed Lady to Pope John XXII. is well known. She appeared to him, and ordered him to make known to all that on the Saturday after their death she would deliver from purgatory all who wore the Carmelite scapular. This, as Father Crasset relates, was proclaimed by the same pontiff in a bull, which was afterward confirmed by Alexander V., Clement VII., Pius V., Gregory XIII., and Paul V."—"Glories of Mary," by St. Alphonsus De Liguori; vol. I, p. 238. Benziger Bros., Printers to the Apostolic See, New York.

St. Alphonsus De Liguori states: "Mary not only consoles and relieves her clients in purgatory, but she delivers them by her prayers." Gerson says that on the day of her assumption into heaven purgatory was entirely emptied."—Id., p. 236.

RIGHTEOUSNESS IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY MRS. C. A. STARR, SECRETARY OF THE EDUCATIONAL UNION,
CHICAGO, ILL.

(Read before the Hinsdale Woman's Club.)

I was requested to take as my theme this afternoon "Religion in Our Public Schools." I prefer to use the term "Righteousness" instead of "Religion."

Religion is mentioned only three times in the Book of books, while righteousness is mentioned one hundred and twenty times. There are some religions whose fruits are not righteousness and peace. The righteousness that exalteth a nation is what we need in America, not the religion that oppresses it.

From what source springs this righteousness? Is it not in the lives of noble men and women whose characters have been formed from principles found in the Decalogue or Ten Commandments and the Beatitudes or the Sermon on the Mount? It was the teaching and living these principles that produced men like Washington, Lincoln and McKinley.

History teaches us that in countries where the Bible is a sealed Book there anarchy flourishes. It took a Kishineff massacre to produce an Aurbuch. The Bible is a universal Book. It ranges over the world as the atmosphere pours around the earth equally at home in all climates and on all continents.

Few books can be carried from the Occident to the Orient, or from the Orient to the Occident, and still retain their interest. A change of civilization kills them, as a change of climate is fatal to some animals. But the Bible, though an Oriental book, has yet penetrated into the Western mind and heart as no other book has done.

Not many books can stand translation without some loss of clearness of thought and depth of feeling, but the Bible retains its color fresh and vivid in any language, even in rude heathen tongues. Many books are limited in their interest to a select narrow class, but the Bible speaks to humanity and finds an audience in every mind and heart. It has equal welcome for the rich and the poor, picturesque stories for the little child and depths beyond the profoundest philosopher. There is a growing apprehension that something is wrong with our people morally. The many crimes of violence throughout the whole country re-

ported from day to day cause us all to shudder with terror. The forcible robberies, the sneak thieves and the astounding defalcations show that multitudes of men are dishonest and are only waiting for an opportunity to steal. Too many are ready to kill and if a little excited or drunk, will take life without compunction. Crimes against the weaker sex, in city and country, North and South, show that the brute has the upper hand and that conscience lies dormant in many a heart. What shall be done about it? How shall crime be repressed, vice diminished and the persons and property of our people be made secure? The police of at least one great city assert that they are powerless to secure safety for the people. Crimes are being committed in secret and unexpected places and in so many different ways that it seems to call for a policeman to guard each family while at home and to accompany each individual while away from home. The safety of the people depends on the virtuous and honorable character of all individuals of the nation. The facts show that we have seriously deflected from this condition. Society is infested with vicious ones ready to become criminals at a moment's opportunity. What shall be done? It is time for our whole nation to wake up to the importance of securing moral health and character for our entire community. We must see to it that every member of our nation is trained in morality. If we cannot train the adults, we must at least go to work and safeguard ourselves by training the entire community of children or we will be irretrievably overwhelmed.

The children in all our schools, public, private and parochial, must be taught the principles of moral life. Many of them are carefully trained, or are supposed to be so, in religious homes, and yet out of many of these come men and women to break unblushingly all the commandments. Many of these children are in church schools, but our prisons show that a very large per cent. of their inmates come from the membership of a body which lays great stress on its parochial schools.

It is increasingly and emphatically impressed upon us that we must go right down to fundamental principles all over this broad land of ours and see that the commandments of God are clearly and forcefully taught to all members of the oncoming generations. There is no time for trifling. Something must be

done, and that the right and the best thing. Of course, our churches are at work to give instruction and to tone up the conscience of the nation, but there are multitudes that never darken the doors of our churches.

Our Sabbath-schools are doing something, our various Christian associations are joining in hopefully, but there are millions of people who are not under the influence of these divine institutions.

We must have better moral training in our public schools. There has been too much deference paid to the disorganized forces of the nation in this matter. Infidelity, unbelief, irreligion, immorality, anarchism, atheism and all the paralyzing hosts of every name have cried out against the reading of the Bible in our public schools. It is not the desire to teach sectarianism in our schools, but the Bible must be honored there throughout the length and breadth of our nation, or we are going to see a generation grow up with increasing disregard for good morals and increasing tendencies to evil. Unless we are to degenerate like other nations that have morally decayed and perished, we must see that our children are trained to know the teachings of the Bible.

If our Bible and our Christ are nothing to us, if we are simply drifting along on the current of the time with no roots of conviction striking down into the eternal granite, then of course these matters will cause no concern. We will pass them by as not worth troubling ourselves about. To this kind of a spirit we give the name of tolerance, but it is really tepidity. We call it liberal, but it is only lukewarm. We characterize it as charity when, as a matter of fact, it is simply coldness. What we call toleration often bears a coward's brand upon its brow. What we parade as charity is often nothing but a lack of conviction, lack of earnestness, lack of intensity. I hold that when any class of people becomes so accommodating, so easy going, so weakly generous as to give away their principles, they have reached the point where they proclaim their own insincerity and hollowness of heart. Now, I am not talking to women of this namby-pamby sort this afternoon. The blood of the fathers is in your veins, and, like them, nothing will so stir you as an appeal to principle and right. Already the Bible is barred from some of our schools and now it is proposed to rule out Christ.

The time has come for a little straight and fearless thinking and speaking on this whole subject. Take first the Bible in relation to our public schools. The question here is not one of sectarianism, it is not a question of this creed or that, but fundamentally a question of national self-preservation. It is admitted on all sides and by all classes of people that the very existence of the Republic depends on the morality of its citizens. Lower the moral sense of the nation, cut the nerve of its conscience, make it indifferent to the eternal verities of right and wrong, and before many decades have passed away its wreckage will be found upon the rocks. But all history shows that morality, to have any life and force, must have its roots in religion.

If we look for the explanation of the lofty ethics of the ancient Hebrews, we shall find it in their religion and in the "Thus saith the Lord" of their prophets, and if we trace to their source the uncleanness, the abomination, the harlotry, the murder and all the crimes that ran riot in France in the days of the French Revolution, we shall find it in the ban put upon the Bible and in the divorcement of religion from morality. At the very beginning of that tremendous upheaval by votes of the National, education in the primary schools was secularized, and what fruit that tree bore is familiar to every intelligent reader of history; and we seem to be on the same road and heading the same way. The State cannot exist without morality, but morality without divine sanction, a morality that does not get its bearings from the skies, is too weak, too uncertain to command the conscience and give strength to human character.

Why is a thing right or wrong? Shall the school teacher answer it by pointing his pupil to expediency, or policy, or to the will of God? But if the will of God is the final appeal—as in the nature of the case it must be—how is that will to be known? The whole Protestant world answers, "*By the Bible.*" If there is any other way that so satisfies the universal heart it has never been reported. The morality of the Bible is the morality of God. It is the transcript of the mind of our Father in Heaven. It commends itself to the reason. Nothing higher can be conceived of and if this morality is not taught what shall be taught?

But if it is taught, how can we consistently exclude the source from which it comes? Shall we have the ethics of the Bible in our schools while the Book itself is denied admission? The absurdity of that position needs no elaboration.

Secularism may enter our public schools and teach its views, sow its seeds, poison the minds of the children with its atheistical doctrines, turn their eyes downward and not upward, sap the very foundations of our historical faith and it is called broad, liberal, Catholic; but if Christianity should presume to cross its threshold with her broad principles of sublime ethics, it is called narrow, bigoted, sectarian and I know not what else. So strangely and persistently are we at the mercy of the minority, and that too on the plea of fairness and freedom from everything like favoritism and partiality.

I should like to ask some of the members of our school boards and our long-headed superintendents and principals if it is not quite as sectarian to teach the Bible of secularism in our public schools as it is to teach the Bible of Christianity. As things stand at present, secularism, backed up very inconsistently I think by the Catholic and the Jew, is having its way here in Chicago. The no-God, no-Bible, no-Christ element of society is allowed to shape the whole policy of education. Let us not be deceived, the sectarianism of the secularist is quite as pronounced, quite as busy as the sectarianism of the Christian and far more dangerous to society and civil institutions!

You are not keeping sectarianism out of the public schools when you exclude the Bible and eliminate the name of Christ—nay, verily, you are making room for a far narrower, far more subtle, far more perilous sort. Sectarianism belongs to all men of every name and school and class. When a man tells you he is so broad, so universal that he has no preference, no predilection, no morality, that to him this is as good as that, one belief as good as another—give him the road and let him go—he is a knave and not worthy of a moment's consideration. Men who think and feel and achieve are men who run in well-defined channels.

Sectarianism is as wide as human life, and the question is, which kind shall we have in our public schools? For my part, and I think I may speak for you and say, for our part, we have

a very decided preference for the kind that flies the Christian banner and stands with both hands on the Bible, yes, both hands, so that some of our "Christian friends" may not take it from us and burn it.

The business of the public school teacher is to give instruction. In so far as their calling leads them into history, they are bound to give us facts. To ignore them or deftly cover them up in the interest of any school, cult or class, is to prove their unfitness for the position they occupy. Men and women who deal with young and forming minds must deal sincerely or bring upon themselves the guilt of infinite havoc. But now in our kindergarten and primary schools Easter comes, Christmas comes, and certain exercises are arranged for the little folks. These exercises start questions in the minds of the children—they want to know what they are all about. What does Easter mean? What does Christmas mean? And to avoid giving offense, teachers must give evasive answers. They must omit the name of Christ. Somebody was born, but they must not tell who. Somebody was raised from the dead, but to whisper His name would be sectarianism. So the play of Hamlet goes on with Hamlet left out. So the children may be told about the candle, the gas jet and the electric light, but be careful not to direct their attention to the great source from which all those little luminaries come, for "we consider the question of the Sun to be sectarian."

The same spirit, the same logic that would withhold the facts of history from the children would do likewise for those further along in years. Here, then, is the history teacher leading his boys and girls through the first three centuries of the Christian era. He finds that some stupendous force has entered into the world. He finds it emptying pagan temples, overturning pagan altars, dethroning pagan gods. He finds it irretrievably pushing its way until, in the day of Constantine, it is nationalized and made the religion of the Roman empire. The cross is emblazoned upon coins and banners and the old religion that has stood for a thousand years gives place to Christianity. Now imagine a school teacher trying to explain all this going into the philosophy of it, endeavoring to make it reasonable apart from the prime mover and central figure of it all, and what a fearful perverter of history he would be! The teacher of physical geography

would not be more absurd if he would undertake to account for the water system of this continent with the Mississippi left out. Or take the Reformation of four centuries ago, whose beneficent upheaval sent its waters of blessing across seas and hemispheres. We go into the history class of our public schools and the lesson of the day is on the time of Luther. Bright boys and girls want to know what caused Luther and whence came the spirit of Protestantism, and the teacher acting under instructions is obliged to dodge the one fact out of which it all came. The fact is Christ. But we consider the question of Christ to be sectarian and so again we have Hamlet with Hamlet left out, and we call it educating the young. Or suppose we visit the literature class; not to be familiar with the great masterpieces of poetry and prose is certainly to have a very defective literary education. I will not speak of the Bible in this connection, for it is under ban, although by all capable of judging it is regarded as magnificent literature, and to study the Bible without Christ would be like studying the sky without the sun. I will refer simply to Dante, to Milton, to Shakespeare, to Mrs. Browning, Tennyson and Whittier. I wonder how the teachers of literature would get along if Christ were ruled out. I touch upon these things to show how absurd, how impossible it is to eliminate Christ if we are to give instruction in literature and history. Why, you cannot even explain a date to a child or tell him why this is March 16, 1909, without running back to Christ!

We speak of this as a Christian land. We speak of our Christian institutions, our Christian Sabbath, our Christian civilization, but what sense or meaning if the name of Christ is left out? Go through our histories, our literature, our art galleries, through the mighty realms of song, through society from top to bottom and eliminate the name of Christ and you will leave the whole fabric like a charred and burnt-out building.

Get rid of Christ? The Christ who made our American Republic possible, and our public school possible, and to whom we are indebted for all the best blessings of our civilization to-day? It is the old cry in a new form, "Away with Him! Crucify Him!"

President Roosevelt, in addressing the Religious Educational Association recently held at Washington, declared that

our national prosperity will avail but little unless it is built upon the superstructure of the higher moral and spiritual life. It is necessary that we should see that the child is trained not merely in reading and writing, not merely in the elementary branches of learning strictly so defined, but trained industrially, trained absolutely to meet the ever-increasing demands of the complex growth of our industrialism, trained agriculturally, trained in handicrafts, trained to be more efficient workers in every field of human activity, but they must be trained in more than that or the nation will ultimately go down. They must be trained in the elementary branches of *righteousness*; they must be trained so that it will come naturally to them to abhor evil, or we never can see our democracy take the place which it must and shall take among the nations of the earth. Again he says, if we read the Bible aright, we read a book which teaches us to go forth and do the work of the Lord, to try to make things better in this world, even if only a little better because we have lived in it. He pleads for a closer and wider and deeper study of the Bible, so that our people may be in fact as well as in theory "doers of the word and not hearers only."

What about the Bible in our Chicago schools? Did you know it was taken out thirty years ago? They tell us there is too much of the foreign element here to admit it. No more, I think, than in New York, and it is read there daily without note or comment. I have a copy of the charter providing for it. At the time of the World's Fair the Educational Union of Chicago made a strenuous effort to place in the schools their excellent little book of "Bible Selections," compiled by a Protestant, a Jew and a Catholic, but were unsuccessful. This past Winter another effort was made by a committee from the Educational Union, but again without success, so far, as you all know who have read the papers.

Now, why should not the Protestant, the Jew and the Catholic be more united in this movement? They each get their religious ideas from the same source. It is very easy to understand why the freethinker and the atheist do not want it—I must say that I admire their consistency when they oppose it—but when the Romanist and the Jew unite with them, crying, "Away with the Bible!" are they not welcoming anarchy into our midst?

I think so. Would you believe me if I told you they would not allow even a quotation from the Bible in one of our schools? The youngest son of Mrs. Cook, our esteemed president, was to take part in a debate and at one time wished to use a quotation from Scripture; his opponent objected. They referred it to the teacher, and the teacher to the principal, who decided that as the Bible was not allowed in the school they could not allow the quotation.

Ambassador Reid, in addressing the New York Teachers' Association, said: "I cannot help feeling that we might profitably take a hint from the old country. Whatever else we may say about the English schools they do turn out well-behaved, orderly boys and girls, respectful to those set over them, grounded in the morals of Christian civilization, with an instinctive sense of obedience to law and a becoming regard for the authorities that represent it. May it not happen that in our effort to keep all questions of religion and morals in what we consider the proper place, they may in reality be left without any place in the training of a good many children? If our English schools, according to our idea, go too far in teaching creeds, may we not be going too far the other way in giving too little space to teaching unsectarian religion and morals, to enforcing respect for authority and to training the habit of mind that secures obedience to law and to its officers? I hope the day will come when there will be harmony in the Protestant and Catholic version of the Bible. The process of secularizing our Government or of banishing from it all religious exercises and acknowledgments and overthrowing our common schools must be met sooner or later by making our written constitutional provisions so distinctly and unequivocally Christian that no court, State or national, will ever call them in question.

To insure peace with progress our nation should not hesitate to declare in its fundamental law what Justice Brewer affirmed from the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States that this is a Christian nation. With a suitable acknowledgment of Christ and His laws as supreme in our national life embodied in the constitution of the United States, the question of the constitutionality of the Bible in the schools of each and every State of the Union would be forever settled.

ASSAULT UPON PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Although we know that our daily press is muzzled and boycotted to a great extent, sometimes a protest against certain abuses is allowed to slip in, for which we give the editors credit.

The following is from the New York American for December 30th :

"Mitchell's Merry Men Now Control Schools.

"Mayor Mitchel is determined to keep the public schools from being adequate and efficient.

"Mitchel is determined that there shall not be proper appropriations for schools. He and Prendergast have even decided that the recreation centres shall go without money to keep them open.

"The only opposition which has stood manfully against the shameful program of reducing educational facilities has been the Board of Education.

"And so the Board of Education is to be packed with appointees of Mitchel who will not stand in the way of the assault upon the schools.

"The Mayor has begun the work by adding eleven appointees to the membership of the Board of Education.

"With the addition of these appointees the Mayor will be in control of the Board of Education.

"With the Board of Education and the Board of Estimate at their beck, Mitchel and Prendergast will have the public school system by the throat.

"It is a shameful condition of public affairs—a shameful and dangerous condition.

"What is the cause of the opposition of Mayor Mitchel and Comptroller Prendergast to the public school system?"

Mayor Mitchel and Prendergast have been making a great outcry about economy, but this mania of theirs has been manifested only in the matter of public schools. Last Summer they cut out the Summer schools, giving as a reason the need for economy, while economy was very far from being practised in other branches of the municipal government.

We can see no other reason for such action but the following: That in closing the public Summer schools there was a great

opportunity afforded for filling the parochial schools with new pupils, who might afterward be easily induced to remain in them all the year.

To expel any shadow of doubt as to the economical bent of Mitchell and Prendergast, the following, from the New York "Press," for January 2d, will be sufficient:

"The United Real Estate Owners' Association, which was instrumental in having named the Legislative Investigating Committee to investigate the city finances, through its president, Stewart Browne, yesterday issued a statement which takes issue with the Mayor for attempting to excuse the city Government before the Browne committee for the city's \$200,000,000 budget. The Mayor is accused of 'playing the baby act.'

"Admitting that the city pays more than its share of the State tax, the real estate men ask what that has to do with the extravagance of the city administration.

"'Before Mayor Mitchel commences to throw stones at the State Legislature and its actions,' the statement of the realty owners reads, 'he had better correct the financial abuses of his own administration. The present city debt exceeds \$1,500,000,000, one-third of which has been unnecessarily squandered. If the city administration has its way, it stands ready to increase the city debt and squander \$300,000,000 more.

"'Mayor Mitchel is no fool,' the statement continues; 'he has an unusually high order of mental ability and grasp of any proposition; no man is better posted than he on city affairs. He knows what the city is up against; he sees the inevitable handwriting on the wall; but he plays the "baby act" when he blames the State for the "smash" he sees coming. He lacks the courage to "face the music" played by his own administration. "He who dances must pay the piper."'"

The above amply proves that the assault upon the public schools has some other reason behind it than that of economy.

On account of an excess of material, we are obliged to postpone the appearance of two articles, one on the Pope's Message to the Unity Conference, and the other on the Panama Congress. We hope to make room for these articles in our March issue.

LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS.

XLVII.

Dear Cardinal:

The statement has been made over and over again, in varied phrase, and under various circumstances, that the aims of your Church are purely spiritual; that she does not seek to meddle in the affairs of Government or exercise any political influence in this country, her whole care being for the spiritual welfare of her own adherents.

I once more emphatically deny that there is any truth in such a statement, with reference to this or any other country, and I can prove that the history of your Church, up to the present time, is one of political strife and intrigue, and that religion has always been used as a cloak to hide from the eyes of the world the true character of the great political machine called Rome.

Every honest seeker after truth must find himself confronted by this puzzling fact—a fact which troubled me greatly, before I became acquainted with what we might call the “secrets of the Vatican”—that the chief factor in the extension of the Church, instead of being a spiritual force, has always been political conquest.

For the sake of better understanding the present, I will ask my readers, for a moment, to glance with me over the records of the past—those records, Cardinal, which you so carefully keep hidden from your own people.

We shall pass over the struggles and intrigues of the Bishop of Rome to secure supremacy in the first obscure centuries of the Christian era, and shall begin the study of our subject with the ascension to the throne of the Emperor Constantine. Knowing that your Church's claim to temporal power, which she traces back to this time, is shadowed by the most shameless fraud and deceit, we are simply amazed to see that a cardinal of modern times, like Merry del Val, has had the affrontery to publish a book on the subject, called “The Truth About the Temporal Power, as Proved by Old Records.” We purpose some day to answer that book and prove that the records used by Merry del Val were “made over” by a skilful Franciscan lay brother, and

to reveal many other interesting facts connected with this subject. But in the life of Constantine we have a sufficient number of generally accepted facts to prove our statement that the chief aim of the Church has always been to dominate politics, and not at all to advance the spiritual Kingdom of Christ.

When I was a child in school I was taught that St. Helena dedicated her son, Constantine, to her God, the God of the Christians, from his birth, and caused the pope to be secretly admitted to the palace to baptize him; and that the child was brought up in the knowledge of the Christian religion, as taught him by his devoted mother. We were taught, also, that when his mother was forced by court etiquette to attend the heathen temple, she was always accompanied by her little son. For his protection she invariably hung about his neck a cross, which was hidden in his breast, and as soon as he entered a temple all the idols fell down and were broken in pieces. Finally, to the joy and satisfaction of his mother, his father forbade him to set foot in any temple. As soon as his heathen father died, he was made emperor, and upon his declaration that he was a Christian his whole empire, following his example, became converted to Christianity.

This is a beautiful story and, having no "politics" in it, furnishes a fine argument to prove the divine origin of the Church and its God-given power to convert the heathen world. When I was beginning my theological studies I had to write an essay upon this very subject, "The Divine Power of the Church," and, of course, my ground for argument was this story, which I had learned in my earliest years and implicitly believed. I received the warmest congratulations from all the Fathers, except one, who, to my amazement, told me that I was in need of true facts to base my arguments upon. My composition, he said, was fine, but it was all wrong because the premises were wrong. He then went on to explain that there existed no record to prove that St. Helena was ever a Christian or that Constantine himself was ever baptized! This was a great shock to me, and my only resource was to study the subject, using every means for the purpose I had at my disposal.

The following are the results of my investigation, supported by the oldest and most reliable historians of your Church:

Constantine was as proud and ambitious as the bishop of Rome. Together they planned a conquest of the East as well as the West. The authority of the bishop of Rome being of little account at that time, he transferred to Constantine his spiritual power, in order to receive it again later from the emperor. In this way he hoped that such authority would never be questioned. So here we see Constantine, a heathen, exercising spiritual authority over the Christian Church. He appointed and deposed bishops, he convoked councils and presided at them, as at the Nicene. He even excommunicated from the Church those who would not obey him, making use of a kind of inquisition against those suspected of insubordination. In some old pictures he is represented wearing the episcopal robes, including the tiara, and giving the papal benediction to the bishops present at the Council of Nice, with the blessed sacrament in his hands (to prove the divine origin of transubstantiation).

But besides being a pagan, Constantine was a man of very low morals. His crimes are notorious. Your best historians, even up to the present time, do not dare deny that with his own hand he killed two of his wives, two of his sons and his own brother, in order to get control of the Eastern empire. Strangest of all is the fact that there is no record of Constantine ever having been baptized, or any attempt having been made to convert him to Christianity, although he was acting as the recognized head of Christendom! It is amusing to see how a historian, such as Alzog, so well recommended by you, Cardinal, gets around this puzzling question. He says that Constantine had such a high opinion of Catholicism, that every time he attempted to receive baptism he was overcome by tears and could not bring himself to feel worthy of receiving it. His high ideal of the purity of life which should characterize a Christian, and his great conviction of the efficacy of the sacrament of baptism were, then, what prevented him from accepting it until an hour before his death! But Alzog evidently forgets that in another place he says Constantine was seized with a high fever and delirium which did not leave him till he died. We may infer that his baptism was *delirious* if not *unconscious*, and similar to those rites the Jesuits afterward administered in India to unconscious

or dying persons, in order to get hold of their bodies and, what was of more importance, their possessions.

Now, here is a question for you, Cardinal: Did Rome seek the salvation of the soul of Constantine or the political advancement and supremacy over the other churches which Constantine was able to give her, if she played into his hands? Did the Church really believe in God and the religion of Jesus Christ, or were popes and bishops really no better than atheists and seeking only temporal power? What is the explanation of the fact that the pope of Rome, who should have acted, and, according to you, did act as the Vicar of Christ on earth, turned over to an unscrupulous and ambitious ruler of this type the supreme spiritual authority of the Church? It is very simple. Constantine was furthering the worldly prospects and interests of the Church of Rome and if the bishop of Rome had dared to reprimand him for his evil life and crimes, he might have met the same fate as John the Baptist, when he reprimanded Herod. At any rate, it is quite certain that if the pope of Rome had followed his spiritual calling the papacy would never have existed.

The reign of Constantine marks the beginning of that career of worldliness, political intrigue and utter renunciation of her spiritual calling by the Church of Rome which shocks the student of history and fills him with horror at the crimes, war and bloodshed of which she has been the cause.

If the Church, as is claimed for her, never sought anything but the spiritual welfare of her people, how can you explain the undeniable fact that the world has never witnessed such moral corruption as existed when the Church was at the zenith of her power, and that this corruption emanated from popes, cardinals, bishops and priests, and by their example was communicated to the masses over which they had undisputed control? Why was it that those rulers who were most devoted to the Church were the very ones to live in most open sin and defiance of moral law? Take the case of Philip the Second of Spain. He had several illegitimate sons who were honored with titles of nobility without any protest from the Church, and therefore none from society.

Coming down to a later epoch, I was shocked to read in the old records found in our archives of the blatant, boasting corruption that existed among religious communities in Spain, before

the "Discloistration" of 1835. The question which always used to disturb and puzzle me most in this connection was: Does civilization really owe more to education than it does to religion?

There is still much to be said on this subject to-day, but the immorality which was in former times so common is to-day less usual, or at least much more carefully concealed from the eyes of the world, because of the marked progress in public opinion. But even to-day I may safely say that morality depends upon individual education. The cloistered convents of nuns, where the influences of civilization have not penetrated, instead of being communities of angels, are—horrible!

And what has the Church done to correct this? Nothing. While persecuting and burning heretics—those noble souls who have protested against corruption and striven for reform—she bestows her distinctions upon her "faithful servants," who have advanced her political claims for the sake of liberty to satisfy their lowest passions and vaulting ambitions.

I had to handle more than twenty cases of immorality among monks, only three of whom were punished with expulsion from the order, not because their crime was greater than that of the others—not at all, it was mild in comparison—but because they were so imprudent as to allow it to become known to outsiders; also, and this probably was the more powerful reason, they were of very little account, and would be no special loss to the order, and therefore could be made an example for the edification of the world. People would be surprised to know the large percentage of offenders against morality to be found in high places in the Roman Church, and the higher up you go the larger is the percentage. I can assure you, and prove it by facts, that piety does not receive its due reward in the Roman Church, nor does it protect any one against the severest of ecclesiastical discipline, if that piety should conflict in any way with Vatican intrigues. But, on the other hand, a man who is a good politician and a not over-scrupulous tool of the hierarchy, is free to do as he pleases in his private life, provided always he avoid public scandal.

Now, Cardinal, if the Church has done so little spiritually for her highest and best, those who form her centralized government and are the administrators of her authority, show me what the Church has done for society in general, for the cause of social

morality, honesty, enlightenment and spiritual well-being? Let us take the lands where she has had full power, for it is there, if anywhere, we ought to find a demonstration of what your Church is and of her boasted zeal for the salvation of souls.

Let me give an example of what she does to further the cause of social morality:

When I went to South America and afterward to Porto Rico, I was surprised to see the large percentage of illegitimate unions. In my own district in Porto Rico, the number of legally married was very small indeed, and like conditions prevailed all over the island. That the people were eager to set themselves right in the eyes of God and society and to recognize their children, is proven by the fact that they flocked to me, when I offered them the marriage ceremony free of charge. In a few weeks' time an illegitimate union was scarcely to be found in all that region, and what was so common before was looked upon with great disfavor, which shows that the blame is not to be laid upon the moral character of these people, as it so often has been.

Let me tell you the real cause, taking as example Porto Rico, which is representative of conditions existing in all the South American republics. The Roman Catholic "Diocesan Bulletin" for the year 1898 published the rates for marriage fees as follows: "From 8 a. m. to 11 a. m., \$8. From 11 a. m. to 5 p. m., \$15. From 5 p. m. to 10 p. m., \$25. From 10 p. m. to 6 a. m., *ad libitum*," that is, at the discretion of the priest.

To oblige a poor man whose wages were then from fifteen to thirty cents a day, paid mostly in provisions, to pay the priest \$8 for the marriage ceremony, was demanding an impossibility. He could never collect such an amount, and the priest could make no allowance in his favor, because he had to divide the profits with the bishop. For the man who had contracted an illegitimate union and had grown children, things were just as bad. He would not want to go to church to be married in the day time, as, through the instigation of the priests, it had become a common custom for a mob to form around the church and celebrate any such belated weddings with the beating of tin cans and hooting at the couple. So even the man who succeeded in the course of years in saving up \$8 found himself obliged to face the ridicule of the whole village, or wait years longer, till he

could save up \$25 or \$50 to pay for a more private ceremony. But the priest always had an eye open to catch those who by hard labor had been able to plant a little crop of coffee or bananas, or own a cow. He would order the judge or *alcalde*, who were usually under his thumb, as he had political control, to send a policeman after that man, rob him of his coffee or his cow, and force him to come and get married.

I know of a case where the priest was gambling and losing heavily. The authorities of the town, the mayor and the judge, were the winners. When the priest came to the end of his money he inquired the names of all the persons of any means in that town who had not been legally married, and proceeded to gamble their wedding fees. In one night he lost them all. The next morning seven cows stood outside the priest's door, and four couples were dragged unwillingly by the police to the Church to be married amid the jeers of the townspeople. The priest performed a hasty ceremony, took the cows and paid his gambling debts. Three of the seven couples who should have come could not be produced by the police, but their cows were there, and the priest was quite satisfied to take them and allow the owners to continue to live as before, undisturbed!

Now, the Church teaches that persons living in illegitimate union are in a state of mortal sin, and are bound for perdition. She teaches that Jesus gave His life for the salvation of souls, and yet a priest or bishop lets the souls under his care go to eternal perdition because they have no money to pay him for the services of the Church. In the same way many children grow up unbaptized, because the priest will never baptize a child without payment of the exorbitant fee required. As every one knows, the Church teaches that there is no salvation for those who are unbaptized. Does this look as if the Church were seeking the salvation of souls, or making the administration of her sacraments a profitable business?

I could give you many instances which all point in the same direction. In the interior of Porto Rico, among the mountains where the roads are nothing but narrow, stony trails, the people lived as if they were in a heathen land, without the slightest indication that they were counted as members of a Christian Church, or that their souls were the object of solicitude on the

part of those who should have been their spiritual shepherds. Sometimes, even in the more accessible country districts, there would be no visit from a priest for ten or fifteen years, and then the "Father" of these poor, neglected children would only deign to come among them if some one of the more wealthy Corsican land-owners sent him a special invitation and made his visit the occasion for pig-killing and rum-drinking and cock-fighting and other festivities. You may be sure that very little of the good Father's time was wasted in saying mass, preaching, marrying and baptizing, except when he was sure of reaping a good harvest.

I know personally all the participants in a case in point, which will no doubt edify our readers. A very pious woman was dying in a country place far up the mountains, and felt she must have the last rites and the absolution of the priest at all costs. Her relatives sent at once to the town to beg the priest to come. They took him a good horse to ride and promised to pay him well for his services. After bargaining for awhile the priest started out and went some distance, but the road began to get worse and worse, and finally he reached a place where not all the inducements held out to him could persuade him to risk his precious neck. So he said to the man who accompanied him, "My son, I can go no farther; you see the great sacrifice I have made in risking my life so far. My absolution will be just as efficacious from here as if I went all the way to the house. Tell your relative she may die in peace, that her sins are all absolved." And pronouncing the formula and making the sign of the cross, he turned his horse's head about and was soon out of danger! As I said, I know the family concerned, the priest, the house in the mountains and every step of the road, as many a time my missionary labors have led me that way; and this case is typical of the general attitude of the priests all over the island toward their poor, neglected flock, and the kind of ministry to souls given by Rome for over 400 years to the swarming inhabitants of the Island of Porto Rico, all of which, before Protestant missions followed the annexation of the island to the United States, she counted as members of her Church.

Very much the same could be said of the whole of South America, the only ray of light in the prevailing darkness being the Protestant missions and the schools and hospitals connected

with them. The question of common school education and medical attendance is one so wide and important that we cannot touch upon it here. But looking only at the question of social morality and spiritual welfare, has Rome fulfilled the mission of the true Church of Christ?

Let us look at the condition of Austria, the country in Europe which is recognized as being absolutely under the sway of Rome. We quote from an article which lately appeared in the "Nineteenth Century" on the "Real Austria," as follows:

"During the last ten years, under the influence of Franz Ferdinand and Sophie of Hohenberg (the late Crown Prince and Princess) bigotry and hypocrisy have reigned supreme; liberal ideas have been interdicted; the people have not been allowed to—and cannot now—think for themselves. But while their thoughts and aspirations are thus restricted, no barriers are imposed on frivolity and immorality. During this decade Vienna has become a veritable Sodom and Gomorrah; orgies are permitted to take place in public restaurants such as it is impossible to describe. Nothing need be added, except to say that the description of Vienna is applicable in a measure to the rest of the kingdom, and to remind our readers that the unfortunate Franz Ferdinand and his wife were hand-in-glove with the Jesuits. Indeed, of the latter it is affirmed that she recognized only one power in this world—the Vatican."

It is well known that Rome manifests a great interest for Austria. Does this picture of moral corruption indicate that her solicitude is for the spiritual welfare of the people? Hardly. But there is an explanation to be found in recent statistics which show that the Austrian clergy "control properties as immense as those of the French clergy before the Revolution and are continually gathering in more. In Hungary alone they possess 1,132,825 hektares of land, with an annual rent of 70,000,000 kronen. According to official figures, this great endowment has grown within eight years by 114,000 hektares. The single Bishop of Grosswardein owns 107,000 hektares. Another, the Bishop of Olmuetz, requires a small army of soldiers to guard his great properties—properties on which the peasantry receive a wage of from eight to ten cents daily! The Church has embarked on all sorts of industrial undertakings—factories, cream-

eries, blast furnaces, sawmills, hotels, banks, saloons. Its income from masses is enormous. In some churches the demand for these is so great that the clergy are obliged to lump the souls of the dead into groups and to dedicate to the entire body that which was paid for single individuals."

Now, Cardinal, if it is really true that the aims of your Church are purely spiritual, as you claim, I should advise you to leave America and begin a work of reformation in those countries where your Church still holds her supremacy, for they do her very little credit.

And if we are to take these countries as a sample of what the results of "making America Catholic" will be, all those who love this land should rise as one man to prevent such a catastrophe, which would mean the bringing to naught of all the high ideals of truth and freedom once implanted on this soil, in suffering and sacrifice.

MANUEL FERRANDO.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN PERU.

The northern republics of South America are the most backward. The fight for religious liberty in Peru has been long and bitter. The strength of the opposition may be inferred from the report of the riotous scenes which attended the passing by the Peruvian Congress last October of the constitutional amendment granting religious liberty. The measure was passed by an overwhelming majority and later was carried over the head of the President, who, on account of the opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy and the women, had refused to sign the act.

Father Diaz, a Deputy, seized the document from the Speaker's hands, and tore it up, amid wild cheering on the part of the women who filled half the Congressional Chamber.

The Congress refused to pass a measure, presented by Roman Catholic representatives, to make civil marriage in Peru more difficult. The bill was prepared a year ago by the president of the Chamber of Deputies, but met with violent opposition. This victory over the forces that desire to maintain the old marriage laws will encourage Congressmen who favor religious freedom. It is difficult for men to agree as to where liberty ends and license begins.